

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

PERCEIVED PARENTING STYLES AND
ADOLESCENT PERSONALITY

BY

CHRISTINE BERNDT

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND
RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

IN

COUNSELING PSYCHOLOGY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

(SPRING, 1988)

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-42790-6

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Christine Berndt
TITLE OF THESIS: Perceived Parenting Styles
and Adolescent Personality
DEGREE: Master of Education
YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: Spring 1988

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF
ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this
thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private,
scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and
neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be
printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's
written permission.

Christine Berndt
(Student's signature)

115 Andrew Crescent
(Student's permanent address)

Spruce Grove, Alberta

Date: April 18, 1988

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled: Perceived Parenting Styles and Adolescent Personality, submitted by Christine Berndt in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education in Counseling Psychology.

E. E. Dox
Supervisor

Joyce Edwards

Gleynwchuk

Gretchen C. Pen

Date: *March 28, 1988*

1

ABSTRACT

One hundred and sixty-six female adolescents, between the ages of fifteen and eighteen, completed five instruments: the Adolescent Perceptions of Parent Behavior Inventory, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, the IPAT Anxiety Scale, the Anagram Test, and the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule.

It was apparent from the results that there were differences among the perceived authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire parenting styles on measures of adolescent self-esteem and anxiety. The finding that the self-esteem of females who perceive their mothers to be democratic is higher than is the self-esteem of those who perceive their mothers to be laissez-faire is consistent with the literature. It was also found that the anxiety of adolescents who perceive their mothers to be democratic was lower than was the anxiety of those who perceive their mothers to be either authoritarian or laissez-faire.

Differences among the three perceived parenting styles were not found for the measures of adolescent creativity and assertiveness.

The purpose of the current study was to test the impact of perceived parenting styles on the personality development of female adolescents. It was predicted that there would be differences among the perceived

authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire parenting styles on measures of adolescent self-esteem, anxiety, creativity, and assertiveness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. E. E. Fox for his professional guidance, positive attitude, and sense of humor throughout the creation of this thesis.

I would also like to express a deep sense of appreciation to my husband, David Berndt, who has provided me with faith, understanding, and endless encouragement. A thank-you is due to our daughters Serena and Justine who have helped in their own special ways.

Additional thanks are directed toward Irene Kwan, Jeannette Cooke, and Lisa Richter.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Authoritarian Parenting Style.	2
Democratic Parenting Style	3
Laissez-faire Parenting Style.	3
Statement of the Hypotheses.	6
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	8
Perception of Parenting Styles	8
Self-Esteem and the Perception of Parenting Styles	12
Anxiety and the Perception of Parenting Styles	19
Creativity and the Perception of Parenting Styles	24
Assertiveness and the Perception of Parenting Styles	31
Demographic Information.	37
III. METHOD AND PROCEDURES.	39
Sample	39
Instruments.	39
Other Data Collection Procedures	45
Investigational Procedures	46
IV. RESULTS.	48
Self-Esteem and the Perception of Parenting Styles	49

Anxiety and the Perception of Parenting Styles	51
Creativity and the Perception of Parenting Styles	54
Assertiveness and the Perception of Parenting Styles	55
Ancillary Findings	57
Summary of Conclusions	62
 V. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS.	63
Discussion	63
Implications	70
 REFERENCES	75
APPENDIX 1. ADOLESCENT PERCEPTIONS OF PARENT BEHAVIOR INVENTORY.	85
APPENDIX 2. PERSONAL INFORMATION FORM	88
APPENDIX 3. TABLES FOR CORRELATIONAL DATA	91
APPENDIX 4. TABLES FOR T-TEST DATA.	104

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
1	Analysis of Variance of the Self-Esteem Scores For the Three Parenting Styles	49
2	Means, Standard Deviations (SD) And Range of Scores For Perceptions Of Parenting Styles For Self-Esteem	50
3	Analysis of Variance of the Anxiety Scores For the Three Parenting Styles	52
4	Means, Standard Deviations (SD) And Range of Scores For Perceptions Of Parenting Styles For Anxiety	53
5	Analysis of Variance of the Creativity Scores For the Three Parenting Styles	54
6	Means, Standard Deviations (SD) And Range of Scores For Perceptions Of Parenting Styles For Creativity	55
7	Analysis of Variance of the Assertiveness Scores For the Three Parenting Styles	56
8	Means, Standard Deviations (SD) And Range of Scores For Perceptions Of Parenting Styles For Assertiveness	57
9	Pearson Correlations Between Age And The Parenting And Personality Variables	92
10	Pearson Correlations Between Grade And The Parenting And Personality Variables	93
11	Pearson Correlations Between Birth Order And The Parenting And Personality Variables	94
12	Pearson Correlations Between Family Size And The Parenting And Personality Variables	95
13	Pearson Correlations Between Marital Status And The Parenting And Personality Variables	96

14	Pearson Correlations Between Relation of Mother And The Parenting And Personality Variables	97
15	Pearson Correlations Between Relation of Father And The Parenting And Personality Variables	98
16	Pearson Correlations Between Socioeconomic Status And The Parenting And Personality Variables	99
17	Pearson Correlations Between Education of The Mother And The Parenting And Personality Variables	100
18	Pearson Correlations Between Education of The Father And The Parenting And Personality Variables	101
19	Pearson Correlations Between Occupation of The Mother And The Parenting And Personality Variables	102
20	Pearson Correlations Between Occupation of The Father And The Parenting And Personality Variables	103
21	Summary of Differences Between Catholic And Protestant Denominations on Self-Esteem	105
22	Summary of Differences Between Catholic And Protestant Denominations on Anxiety	105
23	Summary of Differences Between Catholic And Protestant Denominations on Creativity	106
24	Summary of Differences Between Catholic And Protestant Denominations on Assertiveness	106

Chapter 1

Introduction

There has been a trend in the literature toward a focus on perceptions of parenting styles by adolescents in relation to the study of adolescent development (Gecas and Schwalbe, 1986). In researching adolescent perceptions of parental styles, it is hoped that one can shed new light on the impact of parenting on the personality of the child.

Parental childrearing practices, in general, have been the focus of much current research in the area of child development. Interest in the topic of parenting styles is generated by the fact that parents are considered to be among the most important environmental influences for adolescent personality development (Forman and Forman, 1981). Additionally, research has indicated (e.g., Balswick and Macrides, 1975; Eskilson, Wiley, Muehlbauer, Dodder, 1986; Gold and Yanof, 1985) that the style of parent-adolescent interaction influences the communication and cooperation patterns of adolescents with their parents, peers, teachers, and community members.

The present study addresses the concern for effective functioning of adolescents in their homes, schools and in the larger community. It has been suggested (Coopersmith, 1967) that the inclusion of both

males and females in research is likely to confound the results; therefore, the researcher has elected to study mother-daughter relationships.

Three styles of parenting that are based on the work of Baldwin (1948) and Baumrind (1973) have been selected by the researcher for the present study: authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire. These three parenting styles are defined as they relate to the current study, and they incorporate major dimensions of perceived parental behaviors that have been outlined in the literature.

Authoritarian Parenting Style

Female adolescents in the Authoritarian category typically perceive that their mothers exert a high degree of control over their behavior; restrict their behavior; try to shape and evaluate their behavior in accordance with a strict set of rules and regulations; exert some form of punishment in consequence of their non-compliant behavior; and discourage verbal interaction with them. They tend to perceive that their mothers expect them to respect authority, and to value obedience. Also descriptive of some adolescent girls in this category is their perception that their mothers periodically reject them (Baldwin, 1948; Baumrind, 1973; Maccoby, 1980; Schaefer, 1965b).

Democratic Parenting Style,

Female adolescents in the Democratic category typically perceive that their mothers encourage verbal communication with them; allow them to partake in decision-making for matters that are of concern to them; encourage autonomy and self-direction; and respect them as individuals. They also generally perceive that their mothers are accepting and supportive of them, and that their mothers participate in activities with them (Baldwin, 1948; Baumrind, 1973; Gecas and Schwalbe, 1986; Maccoby, 1980; Schaefer, 1965b).

Laissez-Faire Parenting Style

Female adolescents in the Laissez-Faire category typically perceive that their mothers place few demands or restrictions upon their behavior; assign them minimal responsibilities; demonstrate indifference toward or disinterest in their behavior; avoid the exercise of control; and expect them to totally regulate their own behavior. Additionally, adolescent girls in this category tend to perceive that they have more influence than do their mothers in decision-making for matters of concern to them (Baumrind, 1973; Kelly and Goodwin, 1983; Maccoby, 1980; Rosenberg, 1965; Schaefer, 1965b).

Several factors of child development are affected by parental childrearing practices: social, emotional, cognitive, and more specifically, personality variables.

Although a vast amount of the literature has explored the relationship between parenting and child development, not much research has examined the extent to which the personality development of adolescents is affected by their perceptions of parenting styles. The purpose of the present study is to extend the current research by examining the relationship between the personality of adolescents and their perceptions of parenting styles.

The findings from a considerable amount of research (e.g., Gecas and Schwalbe, 1986; Olowu, 1983) corroborate the assertion that self-esteem is a personality variable of adolescents that is affected by their perceptions of parenting styles. Adolescents who perceive that their parents treat them in an authoritarian or permissive manner tend to have lower self-esteem than do adolescents who perceive that their parents treat them democratically (Gecas and Schwalbe, 1986; Litovsky and Dusek, 1985; Rosenberg, 1965).

There has been some indication in the literature (Forman and Forman, 1981) to uphold the contention that anxiety is a personality factor of adolescents that is affected by their perceptions of parenting styles. Not much literature has focused specifically on this topic. However, findings from research (Fillenbaum & Jackman, 1961; Forman & Forman, 1981) vindicate the

following inference: Anxiety is a factor that is more typical of adolescents who perceive their parents to be authoritarian than of those who perceive their parents to be democratic in their childrearing practices.

The literature (Datta and Parloff, 1967) also upholds the conviction that creativity is an aspect of personality that is affected by the perceptions of adolescents in regard to parenting styles. There is not much literature that relates directly to this topic. However, there is evidence in the literature to infer that an environment in which adolescents perceive that their parents treat them democratically is typical, and an atmosphere in which adolescents perceive that their parents treat them in an authoritarian manner is atypical of creative development (Davis, 1975; Dewing and Taft, 1973; Richardson, 1985).

There is also some support in the literature (Forman and Forman, 1981; Plax, Kearney, and Beatty, 1985) for the contention that assertiveness is a component of personality that is affected by parenting styles as perceived by adolescents. There has not been much experimental research conducted that is specifically related to this topic. However, there is evidence in the literature to infer that assertiveness is typical of adolescents who perceive that their parents are democratic and atypical of those who

perceive that their parents are authoritarian (Forman and Forman, 1981; Kandel and Lesser, 1969).

Statement of the Hypotheses

The present study is structured to test the following four hypotheses.

1. In mother-daughter relationships, there will be differences among the perceived authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire parenting styles in regard to the measure of adolescent self-esteem.
2. In mother-daughter relationships, there will be differences among the perceived authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire parenting styles in regard to the measure of adolescent anxiety.
3. In mother-daughter relationships, there will be differences among the perceived authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire parenting styles in regard to the measure of adolescent creativity.
4. In mother-daughter relationships, there will be differences among the perceived authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire parenting styles in regard to the measure of adolescent assertiveness.

In relation to the organization of the text to follow, chapter two is a review of the literature that is pertinent to the hypotheses being tested. Chapter three is a discussion of the methods and procedures that have been undertaken in the present study. Chapter four

contains a statistical analysis of the results of the study, followed by an interpretation of the findings in chapter five. References and appendices follow the main body of the text.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

A review of the experimental and psychological literature that underlies the present study has brought into focus three important styles of parenting: authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire. Four personality characteristics that are important for the development of adolescents have also been noted in the literature: self-esteem, anxiety, creativity, and assertiveness.

The literature that has been reviewed, hereafter, is organized into six subsections within the present chapter. The first subsection is a discussion of the perception of parenting styles. Subsequently, each of the four aforementioned personality characteristics is discussed in turn, as it relates to parenting styles as perceived by adolescents. Finally, the chapter contains a brief discussion of the demographic information that has been selected for the present study.

Perception of Parenting Styles

The relationship between parenting styles and child development has been widely researched. Two classic studies have focused upon childrearing practices and the development of young children. One study was conducted by Baldwin in the 1940s; the other study was conducted by Baumrind in the 1960s (cited in Maccoby,

1980). Baldwin (1948) identified two major dimensions of childrearing: democracy and control. Baumrind (1973) classified three patterns of parenting: authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive. The classification of parenting styles from the Baldwin and Baumrind studies form the basis of the three parenting styles (authoritarian, democratic, laissez-faire) that are the focus of the present study.

Childrearing techniques that have been outlined in the literature tend to overlap the authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire dimensions that have been delineated for the present study. The following parental practices are similar to the perceived authoritarian parenting style: perceived unreasonableness (Harris, and Howard, 1981); coercion (Openshaw, Thomas, and Rollins, 1984); and parental commands (Smith, 1983). The following parental practices resemble the perceived democratic parenting style: perceived reasonableness (Harris and Howard, 1981); and induction (i.e., parental explanations or reasoning) (Openshaw et al., 1984; Smith, 1983).

The authoritarian parenting style, as defined for the present study, incorporates psychological and firm control. According to Schaefer (1965b), psychological control refers to "covert, psychological methods [e.g., guilt, anxiety, love withdrawal] of controlling the

child's activities and behaviors that would not permit the child to develop as an individual apart from the parent" (p. 555). Firm control involves various degrees of strictness and punishment. Lax control, which is incorporated into the definition for the laissez-faire parenting style, includes extreme autonomy or lax discipline.

Controversy exists in the literature with respect to perceptions of parental behavior and the relationship of these perceptions to adolescent development. Some of the more dated research (e.g., Dewing and Taft, 1973; Nichols, 1964) has focused upon the perception of parental behavior by the parent rather than by the child for studies pertinent to adolescent development.

It is apparent from the findings of Gecas and Schwalbe (1986) that the perceptions of parents are separate from the perceptions of children with respect to parental behaviors. The results indicate low to moderate correlations between the perceptions of parents and those of children for parental childrearing practices. The reports of adolescents were found to be consistently lower than the reports of their mothers for the dimensions of parental support and participation. Similarly, McKenry, Price-Bonham, and O'Bryant (1981) have concluded that parent-adolescent perceptions differ in terms of parental disciplinary practices.

Advocates of the symbolic interactionist position hold that parent-child interaction is mediated by the meaning that adolescents attach to the parental behaviors (Schludermann and Schludermann, 1983). The parental behaviors and attitudes perceived by the children are internalized by them and become part of their psychological structures (Vygotsky, 1962).

Studies that have been based on the symbolic interactionist approach to child development (e.g., Gecas and Schwalbe, 1986; Openshaw, Thomas, and Rollins, 1984; Schludermann and Schludermann, 1983) support the contention that it is the perception of parental behavior by the child rather than by the parent that influences the development of the adolescent. Gecas and Schwalbe (1986) found that the level of self-esteem for adolescents was more closely related to their perceptions than to the reports of their parents in regard to parental behavior. They further indicated that the outcome of reports from parents in respect to their childrearing practices had little effect on adolescent self-esteem.

According to Forman and Forman (1981), personality characteristics of adolescents are influenced by their interactions with family members. They reported that "contemporary personality theorists have devoted a great deal of attention to the influences of parents on

personality characteristics of children" (p. 163). The present study is focused upon the following four personality factors: self-esteem, anxiety, creativity, and assertiveness. In this manner, the investigation can shed light upon the personality variables of adolescents which have been influenced by their perceptions of parenting styles.

Self-Esteem and the Perception of Parenting Styles

Self-esteem is one personality trait that has been reported (Gecas and Schwalbe, 1986; Olowu, 1983) to be influenced by parenting styles as perceived by adolescents. Gecas (1972) has reported that the relationship between self-esteem of adolescents and their perceptions of parental support is important for the effective functioning of adolescents in their environment.

The relationship between self-esteem and childrearing practices has received much popularity in the literature. Most of these childrearing techniques have not been classified as authoritarian, democratic, or laissez-faire, but for the present study, they have been incorporated into the definitions for these three parenting styles. For the parental practices that are not part of the definitions, the commonality between these childrearing techniques and the three parenting styles has been outlined in the previous subsection of

the present chapter.

Consensus among experts as to the nature of self-esteem has not been established. According to Elliott (1984), self-esteem is a dimension of the more global term, self-concept. Elliott has suggested that self-concept refers to "the totality of the individual's thoughts and feelings with reference to himself as an object" (Rosenberg, 1979, p.7). Deman (1982) and Leahy (1981) have focused on the self-image disparity aspect of self-concept. Other researchers (Barnes and Farrier, 1985; Gecas and Schwalbe, 1986; Litovsky and Dusek, 1985) have used the terms self-concept, self-evaluation, and self-esteem interchangeably.

Petrie and Rotheram (1982) have defined self-esteem as "internally rewarding oneself for one's own actions" (p. 964). Self-esteem has also been referred to as "positive or negative self-feelings [as a reaction] to the imagined evaluations of significant adults" (Eskilson et al., 1986, p. 501). Several other investigators (Gecas, 1971, 1972; Gecas and Schwalbe, 1986; Openshaw, Thomas, and Rollins, 1984) have identified subcomponents of self-esteem: self-efficacy, self-esteem power (feelings of competence, and personal influence), self-esteem worth (feelings of moral worth), and self-derogation.

The definition of self-esteem which has been

conceived of by Rosenberg (1965) has been selected for the present study. In the view of Rosenberg, self-esteem refers to the positive or favorable attitudes that one holds toward oneself. Rosenberg has stated, "When we speak of high self-esteem...we shall simply mean that the individual respects ... [herself], considers ... [herself] worthy....Low self-esteem, on the other hand, implies self-rejection, self-dissatisfaction, self-contempt" (p. 31). The following are examples of the aforementioned aspects of self-esteem that correspond with the definition that has been provided by Rosenberg: internal rewards, positive self-feelings, self-esteem power, and self-esteem worth.

Supporters of the symbolic interactional theory postulate that the self-esteem of adolescents is acquired in the process of parent-adolescent interaction: Adolescents internalize their perceptions of their appraised inherent worth that is reflected to them by their parents (Openshaw, Thomas, and Rollins, 1984). According to Gecas (1971), the responses of adolescents toward themselves, and the beliefs that they acquire about themselves are similar to the attitudes that are expressed toward them by significant others. He also reported that parents are among the most important significant persons in the lives of adolescents.

Results of studies that have been based on the symbolic interactional perspective (Gecas, 1971; Gecas and Schwalbe, 1986) indicate that positive self-esteem of female adolescents is related to maternal support as perceived by the girls. Litovsky and Dusek (1985) have reported similar findings from their investigation of perceived parental behaviors and the development of adolescents. These researchers found that adolescents who perceived their mothers to be warmer, accepting, and allowing of autonomous behavior had higher levels of self-esteem than did those who perceived their mothers to be colder, rejecting, and psychologically controlling of their behavior.

Openshaw et al. (1984) have investigated the effects of perceived parental behaviors on various dimensions of adolescent self-esteem. A negative relationship was found to exist between the self-derogation of female adolescents and their perceptions of both maternal supportive and inductive behavior. These investigators also reported a positive relationship to exist between parental support and both the self-esteem worth and self-esteem power dimensions for female adolescents.

Gecas (1972) studied contextual variations of self-esteem. On the basis of his results, he qualified the positive relationship between perceived maternal support

and self-esteem of female adolescents indicated in his earlier (1971) work. Gecas (1972) reported a relationship to exist between the self-esteem worth of female adolescents and their perceived parental support in the contexts of both adults and peers. The self-esteem power of adolescent girls was found to be associated with their perceptions of parental support in the context of adults, but not in the context of peers. Hence, the worth component was found to be more stable across contexts than was the power component of self-esteem. Gecas (1972) has noted that self-esteem, particularly feelings of self-worth, that has been accumulated in one context will to a limited extent carry over to various contexts. The work of Barnes and Farrier (1985) has attested to the stability of self-esteem across time.

Based on their findings, Openshaw et al. (1984) claimed that there is little evidence to support the view that parental self-esteem per se is predictive of the self-esteem of adolescents. In support of this social learning view, Openshaw et al. found only one relationship to exist: Self-derogation of the mother was positively related to the self-derogation of the daughter. These researchers reported that the self-esteem worth component of the parents was more likely to be modeled by daughters who perceived their parents to

be supportive and less likely to be modeled by those who perceived their parents to be powerful. It was concluded by these investigators that the self-esteem of adolescent daughters was more likely to be predicted by direct parent-child interaction than by the modeling of parental self-esteem.

Perceptions of daughters in regard to maternal coercive behavior have been found to correlate negatively with the self-esteem worth and positively with the self-derogation components of adolescent self-esteem. Additionally, a lack of self-confidence and feelings of inferiority and inadequacy have been reported by adolescents who perceive their parents to be coercive (Openshaw et al., 1984). Similarly, Litovsky and Dusek (1985) have noted that a high degree of parental control as perceived by adolescents conveys to them a sense of personal ineffectiveness and incompetency, and discourages them from independent exploration. Eskilson et al. (1986) found that the mean self-esteem score for adolescents who perceived a high degree of parental pressure was lower than for those who perceived either moderate or low levels of parental pressure in regard to academic achievement and success.

Based on his study of obedience pressures in regard to authority, Milgram (1974) reported that the subjects attributed to the authority figure (experimenter) the

initiative for their actions. He suggested that the perceived loss of control by the respondents was related to their lowered feelings of self-worth. In their longitudinal study, Zern and Stern (1983) pointed out contextual variations of the impact of parental obedience expectations on the self-concept development of adolescents. The study involved the relationship between obedient behaviors of young children toward their mothers and the self-concept development of these children as adolescents. These researchers found that obedient behavior in dangerous situations was positively associated with well-developed self-concepts of female adolescents. In trivial situations, obedient behavior was negatively related to self-concept.

According to Rosenberg (1965), the perceptions of adolescents in regard to maternal interest in their friends, mealtime conversations, and academic performance, consistently revealed a positive relationship between maternal indifference and low self-esteem of adolescents. In regard to academic performance, Rosenberg stated, "Apparently more than depreciation and chastisement, and certainly more than praise or support, such indifference is associated with lower self-esteem in the child" (p.141). In the view of Kaplan (1982), parental neglect in regard to school achievement contributes to self-rejecting attitudes of

adolescents. It has been reported (Atwater, 1983) that children who are reared by permissive or neglectful parents typically remain excessively dependent upon the approval of others to gain a sense of personal value.

The above review is an account of the importance of the perception of parenting styles to the self-esteem component of adolescent personality development. There is evidence in the literature to suggest that perceptions of adolescents in regard to supportive or democratic styles of parenting generate higher levels of self-esteem for the adolescent. It is also evident in the literature that both controlling or authoritarian and indifferent or laissez-faire parenting techniques lead to lower levels of self-esteem for adolescents. Hence, it is hypothesized that there will be a difference between the three perceived parenting styles in regard to the self-esteem development of the adolescents. However, further exploration is needed to determine which of the childrearing techniques, authoritarian or laissez-faire, as perceived by adolescents, leads to a higher level of adolescent self-esteem. This latter exploration of perceived childrearing techniques and adolescent self-esteem is a focus of the current research.

Anxiety and the Perception of Parenting Styles

Anxiety is another personality variable that is

affected by the perception of adolescents in regard to the childrearing practices of their parents (Forman and Forman, 1981). Several researchers (Elliott, 1984; Petrie and Rotheram, 1982; Rosenberg, 1965) have used self-esteem as a pivotal point from which to investigate the anxiety of adolescents. For the present study, anxiety refers to "an actual fearlike response or to a tendency to respond with fear to any current or anticipated situation that is perceived as a potential threat to self-esteem" (Ausubel, Novak, and Hanesian, 1978, p. 442).

Ausubel et al. have attested to the importance of the effect of anxiety on learning and on the development of self-esteem. They have reported that anxiety facilitates rote, receptive, and discovery learning, but that it tends to interfere with the more complex, novel types of learning tasks. These researchers have also asserted that students who are highly anxious tend to set unrealistically high academic goals for themselves to relieve their anxiety. Ausubel et al. have stated that since these highly anxious students are no more academically inclined than are nonanxious students, they typically fail to meet their self-imposed high goals.

Ausubel et al. have acclaimed the following:

[The failure to meet such goals] is centrally traumatic to self-esteem and commonly precipitates acute anxiety. Recovery from this condition, furthermore, tends to leave a permanently damaged

self-esteem (p. 446).

Hence, Ausubel et al. have held that a cycle is established in which the low self-esteem of students results from their high levels of anxiety.

According to Rosenberg (1965), factors that contribute to a low level of self-esteem tend to generate anxiety. He found that adolescents with low self-esteem were more likely than those with high self-esteem to have unstable self-conceptions, to present facades, to be extremely vulnerable or sensitive to criticism, and to be afflicted with loneliness; he reported that adolescents with low self-esteem exhibited more psychosomatic symptoms of anxiety than did those with high self-esteem. In support of this finding, Petrie and Rotheram (1982) have reported that high self-esteem is related to lower levels of anxiety and to fewer psychosomatic symptoms of stress.

It is apparent from the findings of Elliott (1984) that vulnerability to the criticisms of others almost entirely mediated the relationship between low self-esteem and social anxiety of adolescents. In respect to the development of social evaluative anxiety, Watson and Friend (1969) have suggested that both fear of negative evaluation and social avoidance and distress are perhaps a function of various experiences in the process of social interaction: e.g., 1) prior disapproval

accompanied with a desire for approval; 2) prior punishment; 3) prior frustration.

Zern and Stern (1986) have asserted that obedience in dangerous circumstances tends to alleviate anxiety associated with being overwhelmed by the situation. However, in trivial contexts, obedience to parents typically arouses conflict, unease, and anxiety within the child. In support of this assertion, Harris and Howard (1981) have found that female adolescents reported feelings of anger in the context of unreasonable parental authority. Similarly, Smith (1983) indicated that although both qualified (reasoning) and unqualified (no reasoning) parental commands maximized compliance, these commands were likely to generate expressions of resentment by adolescents. Watson and Friend (1969) have noted that threats of negative evaluation from significant others will perhaps increase compliant behavior if individuals perceive that their compliance will alleviate the anxiety associated with the threat.

It is reported by Fillenbaum and Jackman (1961) that dogmatism (closed-mindedness) is positively correlated with anxiety. The dogmatic or closed-minded individual does not appear to be descriptive of the sort of person who one would expect to have been reared in a democratic environment. An adolescent girl who

perceives that her mother promotes verbal interaction, decision-making, autonomy, and self-direction (democratic parenting style) (Baldwin, 1948; Baumrind, 1973; Maccoby, 1980) would appear to be typical of one who is open-minded.

Since dogmatism is reported to reflect authoritarianism (Rokeach, 1960), the dogmatic or closed-minded individual would appear to be descriptive of the sort of person who one would expect to have been reared in an authoritarian environment. A female adolescent who perceives that her mother is very controlling and restricting, and who perceives that she must value authority and obedience (authoritarian parenting style) (Baldwin, 1948; Baumrind, 1973; Maccoby, 1980; Schaefer, 1965b) would appear to be typical of a person who is closed-minded.

On the basis of his study, Mow (1969) concluded that closed-minded individuals tend to depend on authority for both direction and support more so than do open-minded persons. It is reasonable to suggest that an adolescent who has been reared in an authoritarian environment would be more inclined to be anxious and to be dependent upon an authority figure for support and direction than one who has been raised in a democratic environment. Indeed the impact of democratic and authoritarian styles of parenting upon anxiety are one

important aspect of this present research.

Forman and Forman (1981) conducted a study to assess the relationship between the family environment and the personality characteristics of adolescents. These investigators discovered that relaxation, sociability and independence were characteristic of adolescents who were encouraged to be decisive, self-sufficient, assertive and expressive of their feelings. Again, such descriptions appear to be more characteristic of an adolescent who has been reared in a democratic rather than in an authoritarian environment.

The above review is a highlighting of the importance of the perception of parenting styles by adolescents to the development of the anxiety component of their personalities. There is evidence in the literature to suggest that the democratic parenting style is atypical and the authoritarian parenting style is typical of the sort of parenting that fosters anxiety within adolescents. Hence, it is hypothesized for this research that there will be a difference between the three parenting styles (authoritarian, democratic, laissez-faire) as perceived by the adolescents in regard to their development of anxiety.

Creativity and the Perception of Parenting Styles

Another personality characteristic that has been reported (Datta and Parloff, 1967) to be influenced by

perceptions of adolescents in regard to parenting styles is creativity. The personality variable, creativity, has received much popularity in the research; however, there is a lack of current experimental literature that addresses the relationship between creativity and parenting styles.

Creativity is defined within the context of various psychological theories. Advocates of the psychoanalytical approach generally have held that creativity is the result of sublimation: i.e., libidinal energies are displaced into creative activities (Taylor, 1975). The view of Getzels and Csikszentmihalyi (1976) has emerged from the psychoanalytic tradition. In their view, creativity is governed by both stimulus-reducing (conflict) and stimulus-producing (discovery) forces. One major view in humanism is that the drive for self-actualization is the source of motivation for creativity (Taylor, 1975).

The position taken in the present study is based on the associationistic perspective of creativity. Supporters of this approach hold that creativity results from an unusual recombination of elements (Taylor, 1975). Mednick (1962) has defined the process of creative thinking as follows:

[Creative thinking is] the forming of associative elements into new combinations which either meet specified requirements or are in some way useful. The more mutually remote the elements of the new

combination, the more creative the process or solution (p. 221).

The work of Kowalski (cited in Mednick, 1962) has revealed that originality is positively related to creativity. The originality component of creativity is the focus of the present study.

The importance of creativity in the development of the adolescent has been well documented by Torrance (1970). He has suggested that creativity is an important resource in stress management and in vocational success. He has also noted the importance of creativity in inventions, arts, and scientific advancements. The view of Einstein and Infeld (1938) is as follows:

The formulation of a problem is often more essential than its solution, which may be merely a matter of mathematical or experimental skill. To raise new questions, new possibilities, to regard old problems from a new angle, requires creative imagination and marks real advance in science (p. 92).

According to Torrance, human survival is dependent upon the creative thought of future generations.

It is evident from the findings of Nichols (1964) that self-reports of originality for adolescents were negatively related to authoritarian attitudes reported by their mothers, and self-reports for their conformity of thought and expression were positively related. In regard to his study of the personality correlates of creativity, Richardson (1985) found a negative

correlation to exist between rigidity and creativity for his sample of Jamaican adolescents.

The work of Dewing and Taft (1973) corroborates the findings of Nichols and Richardson. In accordance with the findings from their study, Dewing and Taft stated that daughters with high creative potential had mothers who reported more equalitarian attitudes and less rejection of outside influences in terms of childrearing, than did mothers of daughters in the control group. It was also found that mothers of creative daughters were more complex and less dogmatic than were those of "noncreative" children. On the basis of the results of their study, Datta and Parloff (1967) indicated that less creative students perceived their parents to be higher in control and enforcement and lower in allowing of autonomy than did more creative students.

Many researchers (Ausubel et al., 1978; Barron, 1970; Davis, 1975; Getzels and Csikszentmihalyi, 1976; MacKinnon, 1970; Richardson, 1985; Torrance, 1970) identified various personality characteristics that were found to be related to creativity. Three major categories that incorporate these personality traits are as follows: 1) independence, 2) sense of well-being, and 3) open-mindedness and flexibility.

First, various traits indicative of independence

were reported to be characteristic of creative individuals: autonomy, dominance, self-assertion, self-sufficiency, and self-control. Second, a variety of traits related to a sense of well-being were attributed to creative individuals: self-assurance, emotional maturity, self-acceptance, and self-confidence. Third, a number of characteristics that are associated with open-mindedness and flexibility were found to be related to creative people: resourceful and adventurous, tolerance to ambiguity, preference for complexity, curious, risk-taking, and novelty-seeking. Other characteristics that have been associated with creative individuals are as follows: introspective, unconventional, insightful, intuitive, and inventive.

It will be recalled that adolescents who perceived their mothers to be coldish, rejective, and psychologically controlling (i.e., authoritarian) were found to have lower levels of self-esteem (Litovsky and Dusek, 1985). Richardson (1985) reported that a sense of well-being was associated with creativity for the adolescents in his study. The authoritarian parenting style is associated with a lower level of self-esteem rather than with a sense of well-being. Therefore, it appears that this parenting style is not conducive to the creativity development of adolescents. Also, an environment that emphasizes control, punishment, and

obedience, which is descriptive of perceived authoritarian parenting (Baldwin, 1945; Baumrind 1973, Schaefer, 1965b), does not typically correspond with the sort of atmosphere that fosters independence, and therefore creativity.

"Self-Actualizing Creativeness is the mentally healthy tendency to be habitually open-minded and flexible, to do whatever you do in a self-confident, unique, and creative fashion" (Davis, 1975, p.563). It would seem that the independent, open-minded, flexible, introspective, intuitive, and unconventional characteristics that have been associated with creative individuals would be fostered by the sort of environment that encourages individuals to question authoritarian attitudes. The view of Krishnamurti (1964) in regard to creativity is as follows:

Creativeness is not merely a matter of painting pictures or writing poems....What is important is to be wholly discontented, for such total discontent is the beginning of the initiative which becomes creative as it matures....When we don't accept or follow, but question, investigate, penetrate, there is an insight out of which comes creativity, joy (pp.47, 50).

Hence, it is reasonable to hypothesize that a democratic environment enhances the creative development of adolescents: i.e., an environment in which adolescents perceive that their parents advocate choice, autonomy, self-direction, and verbal interaction (Baldwin, 1948, Baumrind, 1973, and Maccoby, 1980).

In his research of the disposition toward originality, Barron (1970) concluded that maximal freedom generates maximal creative or original abilities. Krishnamurti (1964) has provided his view of freedom:

Freedom lies, not in trying to become something different, nor in doing whatever you happen to feel like doing, nor in following the authority of tradition, of your parents, of your guru, but in understanding what you are from moment to moment (p.20).

Barron has stated that originality or creativity are enhanced by minimal suppression and by disintegration of complex ideas and re-integration of them at a higher level. Original or creative people, in the view of Barron, refuse to be governed by others in their demand for self-regulation. Results of a study that has been conducted by Wallach and Kogan (1970) indicate that both high and low levels of anxiety are related to low creativity development of children. An intermediate amount of anxiety was found to be conducive to creativity. Hence, it is right to hypothesize that maximal freedom or permissiveness in respect to parental practices as perceived by adolescents would not stimulate an optimal level of anxiety that is necessary for the development of creativity.

The above review is a clarification of the need for current exploratory research in the area of perceived parenting styles and the personality development of

adolescents in terms of their creativity. The dated research (e.g., Dewing and Taft, 1973; Nichols, 1964) that had specifically been concerned with the relationship between childrearing practices and creativity of children had focused on parental rather than on child perceptions of parental behaviors.

There is evidence in the literature to infer that parental authoritarianism as perceived by adolescents does not foster the development of creativity. It is also evident that democratic parenting as perceived by adolescents appears to be more typical of the sort of parenting style that enhances creativity of adolescents. From this, it is hypothesized that there are differences among perceived parenting styles (authoritarian, democratic, laissez-faire) in regard to the creativity development of female adolescents. However, further exploration is needed to confirm which of the three childrearing techniques as perceived by adolescents leads to a higher level of adolescent creativity, and such exploration is the subject of this study.

Assertiveness and the Perception of Parenting Styles

Assertiveness is another component of personality that has been reported (Forman and Forman, 1981; Plax et al., 1985; Stake, DeVille, and Pennell, 1983) to be influenced by parenting styles as perceived by adolescents. In the present study, assertiveness refers

to "a variety of learned situation-specific behaviors, which include making requests; initiating, maintaining, or disengaging from conversations; and expressing both positive and negative personal rights and feelings" (Plax et al., 1985, p. 449).

Other definitions include nonverbal and verbal behavioral components of assertiveness: e.g., paralinguistic speech, eye contact, gestures, and proxemics (nonverbal components) (Serber, 1972); and expressions of feelings, wants, and rights, requests for appropriate behaviors, and refusals of inappropriate requests (verbal components) (Eisler, Hersen, Miller, and Blanchard, 1975; Petrie, and Rotheram, 1982; Rich and Schroeder, 1976; Smye and Wine, 1980). Definitions of assertion have also included covert mediating responses which are associated with low assertiveness: e.g., conditioned anxiety (Wolpe, 1958), and self-criticism (Ludwig and Lazarus, 1972).

The work of Petrie and Rotheram (1982) and Stake, DeVille, and Pennell (1983) attests to the importance of assertive behavior for the self-esteem development of adolescents. In regard to their study of the impact of self-esteem and assertiveness on occupational stress, Petrie and Rotheram (1982) found that assertiveness contributed to the self-esteem of firefighters. Stake et al. have reported similar results. These researchers

observed that assertiveness training increased the performance self-esteem (self-appraisals of competence) of female adolescents who reported low self-assessments prior to their participation in the assertiveness training program.

The findings of Stake et al. are in accordance with the theory of reciprocal inhibition. According to these researchers, the increase in performance self-esteem of the girls from the posttest to the follow-up conditions had resulted from the practice of their acquired assertiveness skills. Stake et al. indicated that the increase in self-esteem for the girls was partially related to their perceptions of positive reactions from others (e.g., teachers, parents) in regard to their assertive behaviors and somewhat associated with their increased feelings of control in social interaction as a result of their assertiveness.

Wolpe (1958) has suggested that assertiveness and anxiety are incompatible responses. Corroborating results have been reported by Forman and Forman (1981) who found assertive behavior to be related to relaxed personality characteristics of adolescents. In reference to the study conducted by Stake et al., it is likely that increased feelings of control and positive reactions (positive reinforcement) from others (e.g., teachers, parents) for the assertive practice

of the girls had the following effect: an increase in the frequency of assertive responses, and a decrease in the frequency of avoidant (nonassertive) responses that had been associated with anxiety. Hence, one can postulate that the reinforced assertive behavior had reciprocally inhibited the avoidance of assertive behavior. Certainly the impact of significant others (i.e., of parents) on the assertiveness of adolescents is the focus of the present study.

Plax et al. (1985) have conducted a study to assess the tendency of adolescents to model the assertive behavior of their parents. In accordance with the social learning theory (Bandura, 1977; Hill, 1985), Plax et al. reported that adolescents who perceived that their parents were both assertive and rewarded for their assertive behavior typically scored higher on measures of self-assertion. In contrast, adolescents who indicated that their parents were either rewarded for nonassertion or punished for assertive behavior typically scored lower on measures of self-assertion.

Forman and Forman (1981) studied the relationship between the family environment and personality variables of adolescents. On the basis of their findings, these researchers concluded that "assertiveness and self-sufficiency characterize children in families which support independence and achievement" (p.166). Kandel

and Lesser (1969) reported that in both the United States and Denmark, parents who were democratic, established few rules, provided explanations for the rules, and involved adolescents in the process of decision-making fostered independence in the behavior of adolescents. These investigators studied the effect of parent-adolescent interaction on adolescent independence in the United States and Denmark.

It is apparent from the findings of Kandel and Lesser that adolescents who had democratic parents experienced more independence than did adolescents who had either permissive or authoritarian parents. Such results are supported by the work of Enright, Lapsley, Drivas, and Fehr (1980). These researchers indicated that autocratic mothering tended to suppress the autonomy whereas democratic and permissive mothering, respectively, tended to enhance the independence of female adolescents.

Kandel and Lesser further affirmed that adolescents who had been granted moderate levels of freedom by their democratic parents typically desired to model these parents. In their study of mothers, daughters, and girlfriends, Gold and Yanof (1985) reported similar findings: Adolescent daughters who identified with mothers whom they perceived as being democratic, affectionate, and suitable role models, developed

personal autonomy and therefore mutuality of influence in their friendships. Forman, and Forman (1981) found that family environments that encouraged adolescents to be assertive, were characteristic of adolescents who typically revealed outgoing and socially bold personality qualities.

According to Ausubel, Montemayor, and Svajian (cited in Atwater, 1983), children who are reared in domineering or permissive environments tend to remain dependent on the approval of others which impedes their development of autonomy. Similarly, Douvan and Adelson (1966) reported that "authoritarian supervision tends to instill in adolescents a heightened dependence on the parents and beyond that, a tendency to lean heavily on external authority beyond the home" (p.170). Undue need for approval, and self-criticism are covert cognitive sets that tend to inhibit the ability of individuals to respond assertively in human interaction (Ludwig and Lazarus, 1972).

The above review is a consideration of the importance of the perception of parenting styles to the assertiveness component of adolescent personality development. There is evidence in the literature to suggest that the democratic parenting style is typical and the authoritarian parenting style is atypical of the sort of parenting that fosters the development of

assertiveness for adolescents. Hence, it can be hypothesized that there will be a difference between the three parenting styles (democratic, authoritarian, laissez-faire) as perceived by the adolescents in regard to their development of assertiveness. The present study is exploratory research to determine if the perceived democratic parenting practice is more conducive to the assertive development of adolescents than is the perceived authoritarian childrearing technique. Also, further research is needed to determine which of the childrearing techniques, authoritarian or permissive, as perceived by adolescents, leads to a higher level of assertiveness. This latter inquiry is also addressed by the present study.

Demographic Information

The review of the literature has brought into focus a number of demographic variables that are related to the effects of parenting styles on various aspects of adolescent development. Gecas (1971) has reported that both the self-evaluation of children and their interactional patterns with their parents are affected by social class. It has also been found that mothers of creative children have obtained either grade twelve or some level of post secondary education. These mothers also tended to equal or excel the degree of education of

their husbands (Dewing and Taft, 1973).

Hence, social class and amount of education are factors that may influence the results of the present study. To rule out these and other potential counter-explanations for the findings, the researcher has selected a limited number of demographic variables from those that have been identified in the literature. The selection of personal information items for the current study was limited to major variables (e.g., age, grade, family status, amount of education of mother and father) to minimize the administration time in the schools (see Appendix 2).

Chapter 3

Method and Procedures

The present chapter contains a description of the sample, and research instruments used in the study. A summary of the procedures for the collection of demographic information is offered. Finally, an overview of the investigational procedures for the data collection and data analysis is provided.

Sample

The subjects consist of 166 female adolescents in total who are between the ages of 15 and 18. Of the total sample size, 133 of the girls are from the Memorial Composite High School in Stony Plain, Alberta, and 33 of the girls are from St. Marguerite Catholic School in Spruce Grove, Alberta.

The girls from the Memorial High School who agreed to participate in the study were volunteers from various classes (e.g., typing, social studies, home economics, psychology, physical education). The girls from St. Marguerite School who agreed to participate in the study were volunteers from the entire grade 10, 11, and 12 female population. In each of the two schools, a relatively equal number of females at each of grades 10, 11, and 12 participated in the study.

Instruments

The following 5 instruments were employed to

collect data for the present study: the Adolescent Perceptions of Parent Behavior Inventory (APPBI), the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (S-E Scale), the IPAT Anxiety Scale, the Generation Test, and the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule (RAS). A description of each instrument is provided in turn.

Adolescent Perceptions of Parent Behavior Inventory

The Adolescent Perceptions of Parent Behavior Inventory (APPBI) was designed to measure the perceptions of female adolescents in regard to the childrearing practices of their mothers. The researcher selected items from the Schaefer (1965a) original version and from the Margolies and Weintraub (1977) revised 56-item version of the Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI) to construct the APPBI.

The APPBI is a forced-choice research tool in which the adolescent is required to select one of three categories which she perceives to be most descriptive of the behavior of her mother toward her:

Category A (Democratic)

Category B (Authoritarian)

Category C (Laissez-faire).

A copy of the APPBI is provided in Appendix 1. For the purpose of data analysis, the categories A, B, and C are coded as 1, 2, and 3, respectively. Scoring the survey —

involves recording the category 1, 2, or 3 that was selected by the respondent. The survey takes approximately five minutes for the adolescent to complete and is self-administered.

Seven informed judges have attested to the validity of the APPBI as a measure of three distinct parenting styles (Authoritarian, Democratic, Laissez-faire) as perceived by the child.

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

Rosenberg (1965) developed a 10-item Self-Esteem Scale (S-E Scale) to measure the level of self-acceptance of the respondent. The respondents indicate their agreement or disagreement with statements that describe either favorable or unfavorable self-attitudes.

The subjects choose one of the following four alternatives for each item:

- 1 = strongly agree
- 2 = agree
- 3 = disagree
- 4 = strongly disagree.

The following steps are employed to score the S-E Scale. (1) The scores are reversed for the positive items (e.g., 1=4, 2=3, 3=2, 4=1). (2) The scores are summed across the ten items. This scale usually takes no longer than five minutes for the respondent to complete and is self-administered.

Silber and Tippet (1965) reported the test-retest reliability coefficient for the S-E Scale to be 0.85 for a two-week interval. The work of Openshaw, Thomas, and Rollins (1981) has attested to the two dimensions (positive self-esteem and derogation) of the S-E Scale as being reliable and valid indicators of self-esteem.

IPAT Anxiety Scale

Cattell (1976) constructed the IPAT Anxiety Scale. This 40-item research tool was designed to measure the level of trait anxiety of respondents. The subjects indicate the degree to which each item is characteristic of their feelings or thoughts toward themselves.

The subjects select one of three possible alternatives (a, b, or c) for each item. The three alternatives vary for each item. For example, for item one, the respondent chooses one of the following three alternatives:

- a) true
- b) in between
- c) false.

However, for item four, the subject selects one of the following three choices:

- a) sometimes
- b) seldom
- c) never

An answer key is provided for the Anxiety Scale. The

response of the subject for each item is scored 2, 1, or 0. The scores are summed across the 40 items to obtain the total raw score. This Anxiety Scale requires five to ten minutes for the respondent to complete and is self-administered.

In terms of reliability, test-retest coefficients range from 0.82 to 0.93. The correlation between the scores on the two halves of the form (split-half reliability) range from 0.78 to 0.92 (McReynolds, 1985). In his critical review, McReynolds (1985) has concluded that the Anxiety Scale Questionnaire yields a valid measure of trait anxiety.

Anagram Test

The Anagram Test is an instrument that has been designed to measure the degree of originality or creativity of the respondent (Barron, 1970; Mednick, 1962). The test requires the respondent to use the letters in GENERATION to construct as many smaller words as possible; each letter can be used only once for the construction of each word. For example, one can construct the word EAR but not the word EARRING because the latter word has two Rs and GENERATION has only one R.

The scoring of the Anagram Test is based on the statistical infrequency of individual responses for the entire sample. A time limit of 5 minutes is set. The

weightings assigned for each word range from 1 through 10. A word that occurs only once in the total sample is assigned a weighting of 10; a word that occurs ten times in the entire sample is assigned a weighting of 1; and a word that occurs more than 10 times in the sample is assigned 0 points. The weightings for each subject are summed to yield the total score. The Anagram Test is reported to be a valid measure of originality (Barron, 1970; Mednick, 1962).

Rathus Assertiveness Schedule

The Rathus Assertiveness Schedule (RAS), which was developed by Rathus (1973), was designed to measure the assertive behavior of respondents. The original form consisted of 30 items; however, Rathus has reported that a shortened 19-item version of the scale can be used with accurate results. The subjects indicate the extent to which each item is characteristic or descriptive of themselves.

The subjects choose one of the following six alternatives for each item:

- +3 ~~very~~ characteristic of me, extremely descriptive
- +2 rather characteristic of me, quite descriptive
- +1 somewhat characteristic of me, slightly descriptive
- 1 somewhat uncharacteristic of me, slightly
nondescriptive
- 2 rather uncharacteristic of me, quite nondescriptive

-3 very uncharacteristic of me, extremely nondescriptive.

The following steps are employed to obtain the total score of the RAS. (1) The signs of the reversed items as indicated by an asterisk (*) are changed. For example, for item 1*, the sign for the response -3 (very uncharacteristic of me, extremely nondescriptive) would be changed from (-) to (+) 3. (2) The numerical responses across all items are summed. The RAS scale requires about five to ten minutes for the respondent to complete and is self-administered.

The work of Rathus (1973) has found the RAS to yield a test-retest correlation coefficient of 0.78 for a 2-month interval, and a split-half reliability correlation of 0.77. The correlation between self-reported RAS scores and an external measure of assertiveness yielded a coefficient of 0.71 (Rathus, 1973).

Other Data Collection Procedures

Demographic Information

The respondents were asked to complete a Personal Information Form. General information pertinent to the daughter, the family members, and the parents was collected. A copy of the form appears in Appendix 2. The obtained information was coded and used for a discussion of ancillary findings.

A revised socioeconomic index for occupations in Canada (Blishen and McRoberts, 1976) was employed in the present study. Blishen and McRoberts indicated that their revised socioeconomic index was based upon 1971 Canadian census data and incorporated only the occupations of the male labor force. This revised socioeconomic index was used to classify the occupations of both the mothers and fathers in the present study. The socioeconomic status of the family was determined by an observation of the socioeconomic indices for the occupational classifications of the mother and father living with the family. The higher of the two socioeconomic indices was selected to determine the class interval (1=high socioeconomic status, 6=low socioeconomic status) of the family.

Investigational Procedures

Data Collection

A survey was employed to assess the perceptions of female adolescents in regard to the childrearing practices of their mothers. Questionnaires were used to measure the self-esteem, anxiety, and assertiveness components of adolescent personality development. An Anagram Test was employed to assess the creativity of adolescents. Finally, a Personal Information Form was used to collect demographic data.

The researcher assembled with the grade 10, 11, and 12 girls at St. Marguerite School for thirty-five minutes during the school day to administer the research instruments. At Memorial Composite High School, the researcher attended many classes (e.g., physical education, psychology, social studies, home economics) to administer the instruments to groups of female adolescents. The assessment battery for each girl was returned to the researcher upon its completion.

Data Analysis

The results of the data gathering were keyed into the MTS computer system. Statistical tests involved the computation of 4 one-way ANOVAS and, in the cases necessary, the Scheffé multiple comparison of means. Confirmation of the hypotheses as a result of the analysis was set to be contingent upon the attainment of a .05 level of confidence. In addition, a correlational matrix, a chi-square test, and a series of t-tests were generated for a discussion of ancillary findings.

Chapter 4

Results

The present chapter contains an analysis of the data. Hereafter, the researcher refers to the underlying or working hypotheses rather than to the statistical (i.e., null) or formal hypotheses. It has been hypothesized that in mother-daughter relationships, there will be differences among the perceived authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire parenting styles in regard to measures of adolescent self-esteem, anxiety, creativity, and assertiveness.

To determine whether the sample means for the three groups of perceived parenting styles were different from each other ($p \leq .05$) on measures of self-esteem, anxiety, creativity, and assertiveness, a one-way ANOVA was computed for each of these four personality variables. Subsequently, the Scheffé multiple comparison of means was also computed for each of the one way ANOVAS to determine which pair(s) of the three sample means differ from one another ($p \leq .05$).

The chapter contains the following structure for each of the four personality variables in regard to adolescent perceptions of parenting styles: a statement of the hypothesis, an analysis (one-way ANOVA, Scheffé test), and a conclusion. Following the statistical analysis and conclusion for each of the four hypotheses

is a discussion of ancillary findings.

Self-Esteem and the Perception of Parenting Styles

Hypothesis

In mother-daughter relationships, there will be differences among the perceived authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire parenting styles in regard to the measure of adolescent self-esteem.

Analysis

ANOVA

Results of the ANOVA indicate that there could be a difference between at least two of the sample means (see Table 1). To detect which pairs of the three sample means differ significantly from one another, the Scheffé multiple comparison of means was computed.

TABLE 1

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE SELF-ESTEEM SCORES
FOR THE THREE PARENTING STYLES

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between	199.62	2	99.81	4.68	.01
Within	3475.93	163	21.33		

Scheffé Test

An examination of the sample means in Table 2 reveals that the perceived democratic and laissez-faire groups are different from one another at the .05 level

of confidence. It can also be seen from Table 2 that there is no difference between the perceived democratic and authoritarian parenting styles, nor between the perceived authoritarian and laissez-faire parenting styles.

TABLE 2
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD) AND RANGE OF SCORES
FOR PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTING STYLES
FOR SELF-ESTEEM

Group	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum	N
Democratic	29.26 _a	4.30	20	40	96
Authoritarian	27.61	5.40	14	38	49
Laissez-faire	26.24 _b	4.11	17	33	21

Note. Means with different subscripts differ significantly at $p \leq .05$. For the Scheffé Procedure, the Table Ranges for the .05 alpha level are 3.49 to 3.49.

Conclusion

The findings relevant to the ANOVA and Scheffé tests contain confirmatory evidence for the hypothesis that there are differences among the perceived authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire parenting styles in regard to the measure of adolescent self-esteem. More specifically, these results lead one to

the following conclusion: The level of self-esteem for female adolescents who perceive their mothers to be democratic in their parenting style is higher than is the level of self-esteem for those who perceive their mothers to be laissez-faire in their childrearing practices.

Anxiety and the Perception of Parenting Styles Hypothesis

In mother-daughter relationships, there will be differences among the perceived authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire parenting styles in regard to the measure of adolescent anxiety.

Analysis

ANOVA

One can see from the results of the ANOVA that there may be a significant difference between at least two of the sample means (see Table 3). Therefore, the Scheffé multiple comparison of means has been computed to determine which pair(s) of the three sample means differ from one another.

TABLE 3
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE ANXIETY SCORES
FOR THE THREE PARENTING STYLES

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between	3179.91	2	1589.95	13.98	.00004
Within	18541.44	163	113.75		

Scheffé Test

An inspection of the sample means in Table 4 reveals that two pairs of sample means are different from one another at the .05 level of confidence. 1) There is a difference between the sample means for the perceived democratic and laissez-faire parenting styles. 2) The sample means for the perceived democratic and authoritarian parenting styles are also different from each other.

It is also apparent from Table 4 that there is no difference between the sample means for the perceived authoritarian and laissez-faire parenting styles.

TABLE 4
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD) AND RANGE OF SCORES
FOR PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTING STYLES
FOR ANXIETY

Group	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum	N
Authoritarian	46.08 _a	10.49	24	68	49
Laissez-faire	44.57 _a	8.78	28	59	21
Democratic	36.81 _b	11.11	9	58	96

Note. Means with different subscripts (i.e., a & b) differ significantly at $p \leq .05$. Means having the same subscript are not significantly different at $p \leq .05$. For the Scheffé Procedure, the Table Ranges for the .05 alpha level are 3.49 to 3.49.

Conclusion

The results of the above tests lead one to accept the hypothesis that there are differences among the perceived authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire parenting styles in regard to the measure of adolescent anxiety. In particular, it is evident from these results that the anxiety level of female adolescents who perceive their mothers to be democratic in their parenting style is lower than is the anxiety level of those who perceive their mothers to be either authoritarian or laissez-faire in their approach to

childrearing.

Creativity and Perceptions of Parenting Styles

Hypothesis

In mother-daughter relationships, there will be differences among the perceived authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire parenting styles in regard to the measure of adolescent creativity.

Analysis

ANOVA

It is apparent from the results of the ANOVA that there are no differences among the sample means at the .05 level of probability (see Table 5). Hence, the Scheffé multiple comparison of means has not been computed. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 5

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE CREATIVITY SCORES
FOR THE THREE PARENTING STYLES

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between	241.85	2	120.92	1.01	.37
Within	19496.08	163	119.61		

TABLE 6
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD) AND RANGE OF SCORES
FOR PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTING STYLES
FOR CREATIVITY

Group	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum	N
Laissez-faire	12.14	12.66	0	41	21
Democratic	10.15	11.65	0	68	96
Authoritarian	8.27	8.41	0	29	49

Conclusion

The results of the ANOVA do not contain evidence to ratify the hypothesis that there are differences among the perceived authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire parenting styles in regard to the measure of adolescent creativity. Rather, the findings lead the researcher to reject the hypothesis, and to conclude that there are no differences among the perceived parenting styles in regard to adolescent creativity.

Assertiveness and the Perception of Parenting Styles Hypothesis

In mother-daughter relationships, there will be differences among the perceived authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire parenting styles in regard to the measure of adolescent assertiveness.

Analysis

ANOVA

As may be determined from Table 7, the results of the ANOVA indicate that there are no significant differences among the sample means at the .05 level of confidence. Therefore, the Scheffé test has not been calculated. The means, standard deviations, and ranges of scores have been computed and are presented in Table 8.

TABLE 7

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF THE ASSERTIVENESS SCORES FOR THE THREE PARENTING STYLES

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Between	1204.94	2	602.47	1.89	.15
Within	51956.29	163	318.75		

TABLE 8
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS (SD) AND RANGE OF SCORES
FOR PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTING STYLES
FOR ASSERTIVENESS

Group	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum	N
Authoritarian	56.65	16.64	23	99	49
Democratic	54.30	18.55	15	94	96
Laissez-faire	47.62	17.31	18	78	21

Note. A constant (57) has been added to each of the original Minimum and Maximum scores to convert negative values into positive ones.

Conclusion

It is apparent that the findings do not support the hypothesis. In fact, the results lead the researcher to reject the hypothesis, and to conclude that there are no differences among adolescent perceptions of parenting styles in regard to the measure of assertiveness.

Ancillary Findings

Introduction

To rule out counterhypotheses as alternative explanations for the findings, the researcher has computed Pearson product-moment correlations (one-tailed significance), t-tests (two-tailed significance), and a chi-square test on some selected potential sources of

counter-explanations. In this subsection, an analysis of the relationships among the demographic, parenting, and personality variables are analyzed. To simplify the analysis, the dependent variables (self-esteem, anxiety, creativity, and assertiveness) are collectively referred to as personality variables; the independent variable (perception of parenting styles) is simply referred to as the parenting variable. The specific correlations and t-test results appear in Appendix 3 and 4, respectively.

Borg and Gall (1983) have indicated that "practical significance is more important than [is] statistical significance" (p. 623). In regard to the correlational data for the present study, the significant correlation coefficients range from .13 to .25 (see Appendix 3, Tables 9 to 20). Although such correlation coefficients are statistically significant, in each case, the common variance (r^2) of the two variables that have been correlated is minimal (e.g., $.13^2 = .02$; $.25^2 = .06$). Such correlations are trivial in a practical sense and, therefore, are not indicative of counter-explanations for the findings.

Analysis

Litovsky and Dusek (1985) have reported that older adolescents perceive their parents to be less accepting than do younger adolescents. Hence, to exclude the

possibility that age and grade confound the results of the present study, each of these factors was correlated with the parenting and personality variables. In a practical sense, no correlations were found to be significant (see Appendix 3, Tables 9 and 10).

Conflicting results have been documented in the literature concerning the effect of birth order on self-esteem. Coopersmith (1967) found that being a first-born child was predictive of self-esteem whereas Rosenberg (1965) found a slight relationship to exist between birth order and self-esteem of the adolescent. To rule out the possible interference of birth order and family size (i.e., number of children in the family) on the results, each of these factors has been correlated with the parenting and personality variables. The results indicate no practically significant correlations (see Appendix 3, Tables 11 and 12).

According to Coopersmith (1967), the greatest number of subjects with low self-esteem were living with remarried parents. To eliminate marital status, relationship to mother (e.g., biological, step), and relationship to father as possible contaminating factors, each of these variables was correlated with the personality and parenting variables. In a practical sense, the correlations are not significant (see Appendix 3, Tables 13, 14, and 15).

Conflicting results are reported in the literature in regard to the effect of socioeconomic status on self-esteem. The findings of Coopersmith indicate that socioeconomic status is not predictive of self-esteem. Gecas (1971) has found some evidence to support the contention that social class is related to self-esteem. Rosenberg found that children from higher social class are more likely than those from lower social class to be self-acceptant. Consequently, socioeconomic status was correlated with the parenting and personality variables to exclude the possibility that social class has confounded the results of the present study. The findings are not practically significant (see Appendix 3, Table 16).

According to Dewing and Taft (1973) the education level of mothers is related to the creativity of their children. Also reported to be associated with creativity of the child is the education level of the mother being equal to or greater than that of the father. It is apparent from the findings of the present study that a positive correlation exists between the education level of the mother and that of the father ($r = .37$, $p = .0004$, $n = 166$). However, to eliminate the possibility that the level of education of the mother and father has interfered with the results, this factor (for both the mother and father) has been

correlated with the parenting and personality variables. These correlations are trivial (see Appendix 3, Tables 17 and 18).

The correlational findings indicate that a negative relationship exists between birth order and the education level of the mother ($r = .40$, $p = .01$, $n = 166$) and also between birth order and the education level of the father ($r = .30$, $p = .01$, $n = 166$). Hence, it is evident that the lower the ordinal position of the adolescent, the higher is the education level of the parents. However, it will be recalled that in a practical sense, neither birth order nor education level of the parents is correlated with the parenting and personality variables.

The occupation of each the mother and father was correlated with the parenting and personality variables. The purpose of these correlations is to rule out the possibility that occupation is a factor which confounds the results of the study. The correlations are trivial (see Appendix 3, Tables 19 and 20).

To rule out the possibility that religious denomination interferes with the findings of the present study, a t-test for independent groups (i.e., Catholic, Protestant) was computed for each of the four personality variables ($p \leq .05$). It is apparent from the results of the t-tests that no differences exist

between the two religious groups in terms of the personality variables (see Appendix 4, Tables 21-24). Further, a chi-square test was computed to exclude the possibility that religious affiliation contaminates the perceptions of adolescents in regard to parenting styles. No differences in perceptions of parenting styles between the Catholic and Protestant denominations were found at the .05 level of significance ($\chi^2 = 1.66$, $df = 2$, $p = .44$).

Summary of Conclusions

The findings of the present study bring into focus three major conclusions. 1) The level of self-esteem for female adolescents who perceive their mothers to be democratic in their approach to childrearing is higher than is the level of self-esteem for those who perceive their mothers to be laissez-faire in their style of parenting. 2) Those female adolescents who perceive their mothers to be democratic are less anxious than are those who perceive their mothers to be authoritarian. 3) Those female adolescents who perceive their mothers to be democratic are less anxious than are those who perceive their mothers to be laissez-faire in their parenting style.

Chapter 5

Discussion and Implications

Discussion

Personality and Parenting Styles

Forman and Forman (1981) noted the importance of parental influence on the personality development of adolescents. Several researchers (e.g., Datta and Parloff, 1967; Forman and Forman, 1981; Gecas and Schwalbe, 1986; Plax, et al., 1985) have studied the impact of perceived parenting styles on various aspects of adolescent personality development. These personality dimensions were the focus of the present study and are as follows: self-esteem, anxiety, creativity, and assertiveness.

The expectation that differences would be found among the perceived authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire parenting styles was in fact supported for the self-esteem and anxiety components of adolescent personality. It was found that female adolescents who perceive their mothers to treat them democratically had higher levels of self-esteem than did those who perceive their mothers to treat them in a laissez-faire manner. These results support the findings in the literature (i.e., Atwater, 1983; Kaplan, 1982; Rosenberg, 1965).

It is reasonable to query as to why perceived

laissez-faire parenting styles are associated with lower levels of self-esteem for female adolescents. Rosenberg has proposed that the following perceptions of adolescents are vital to the self-worth component of their personalities: the perceptions that they are important to their mothers and that their mothers are interested in them. Maternal indifference, on the other hand, is related to lower levels of self-esteem. In the view of Kaplan (1982), self-rejecting attitudes of youths develop as a result of their inability to defend against, cope with, or adapt to a range of circumstances which include parental neglect.

The finding that perceived laissez-faire parenting is related to lower self-esteem is well-grounded in light of the fact that girls who perceive their mothers to be laissez-faire, typically believe that their mothers are nonrestrictive, noncontrolling, and nonregulative of their behavior (Baumrind, 1973; Maccoby, 1980; Schaefer, 1965b). Such views appear to be in agreement with perceptions of parental indifference and neglect which are related to the tendency of adolescents to devalue themselves.

It is also plausible to determine possible reasons for the association between perceived parental democracy and the higher mean self-esteem scores of adolescents. Elder (cited in Litovsky and Dusek, 1985) has suggested

that adolescents who perceive their parents as being democratic typically feel wanted and accepted by their parents. Hill (cited in Litovsky and Dusek, 1985) has noted that such adolescents perceive that their parents encourage them to discover their own competencies which fosters their self-concept development.

The finding that the girls who perceive their mothers to be democratic are less anxious than are those who perceive their mothers to be laissez-faire deserves mention. One explanation for this finding is inferred from the literature. According to Coopersmith (cited in Lewis, 1981), children without clear parental guidance have no basis upon which to develop internal controls, defenses, and solutions for problematic situations. Such children are believed to have a lower sense of self-confidence which is characterized by self-doubt and anxiety. Typical of adolescents who perceive their mothers to be laissez-faire is the view that their mothers expect them to be totally self-regulating (Maccoby, 1980). Hence, in the present study, a higher anxiety level for female adolescents who perceive their mothers to be laissez-faire, and therefore lacking in maternal guidance, is a valid finding.

The question remains as to why anxiety was found to be higher for girls who perceive their mothers to be authoritarian than for those who perceive their mothers

to be democratic. It is evident from the work of Eskinsson et al. (1986) that perceived parental pressure for academic achievement was found to be negatively related to the assessment of adolescents of their ability to meet these parental expectations.

Adolescents who predict punishment for noncompliance with strict rules (perceived authoritarianism) perhaps fear maternal rejection (Maccoby, 1980; Schaefer, 1965b). Therefore, extreme parental pressure for academic performance as perceived by adolescents is likely associated with higher levels of anxiety.

Another possibility for the above question is of interest. Forman and Forman (1981) found that a nonanxious or relaxed state is descriptive of adolescents who are encouraged to openly and directly express their feelings. The finding that perceived democratic parenting is associated with lower anxiety is perhaps attributable to the fact that girls who perceive their mothers to be democratic, typically believe that they are encouraged to express their own points of view (Maccoby, 1980). On the other hand, the typical perception of girls who perceive their mothers to be authoritarian is that verbal interaction with their mothers is discouraged (Maccoby, 1980). Such a perception is possibly related to the finding of the present study that perceived authoritarian parenting is

related to higher anxiety.

Additionally, females from authoritarian environments typically perceive that their mothers strive to control them, to restrict their behavior, and to instill within them the value of obedience (Baldwin, 1948; Baumrind, 1975). Hence, females from such environments are perhaps more anxious about maternal pressures to obey as they are likely to perceive these pressures as trivial and therefore as controlling and restrictive of their behavior (Zern and Stern, 1986).

It is clear from the findings that there are differences among the three parenting styles for measures of adolescent self-esteem and anxiety. Such findings contain evidence for the validity of the Adolescent Perceptions of Parental Behavior Inventory as a measure of three distinct, perceived parenting styles: authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire.

Contradicted Hypotheses

The anticipated differences among the perceived authoritarian, laissez-faire, and democratic parenting styles for measures of creativity and assertiveness did not materialize. The researcher had also suspected that female adolescents who perceive their mothers to be democratic would have reported higher levels of self-esteem than did those who perceive their mothers to be authoritarian. The findings of Gecas and Schwalbe

(1986) contain a possible reason why this was not found to be the case.

These researchers found that perceived parental control (i.e., authoritarianism) had more of an impact on the self-esteem of males, whereas perceived parental support and participation (i.e., democracy) had more of an affect on the self-esteem of females. These researchers reported that the self-esteem of females had consistently been unaffected by their perceptions of parental control. In the current study, the self-esteem of the girls appeared not to be negatively affected by the perceived authoritarian parenting style. In light of these findings, the lack of a difference between the perceived authoritarian and democratic parenting styles for the measure of self-esteem is sound.

The fact that the findings fall short of the prediction that differences would be found among the perceived parenting styles on the measure of adolescent creativity-originality, requires examination. One possibility for this unexpected result lies in the reported difficulty in measuring creativity. Taylor (1975) has noted that "creativity is often not responsive to conscious efforts to initiate or control it since it is highly unpredictable and is resistant to scheduling" (p. 24). Perhaps the time limit of five minutes which was imposed upon the girls interfered with

their creative responses. However, time constraints for data collection within the school environment were necessary. In addition to being a measure of originality, the Anagram Test appears to reveal language ability (Fox, 1969). Perhaps language ability interferes with creative responses of the girls.

An alternative possibility is that parenting styles per se are not related to the creative development of adolescents. Genetic factors or other variables such as motivation, family, peers, culture, and schools (Ausubel et al., 1978) perhaps subtly influence the creative development of adolescents.

The results of the study did not bear out the prediction that there would be differences among the perceived parenting styles on the measure of adolescent assertiveness. This unanticipated finding deserves attention. Rich and Schroeder (1976) reported that the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule appears to be more of a global estimate of assertiveness than a measure of assertive responses to specific situations. Perhaps the RAS was not sensitive to situational components of assertiveness for female adolescents in the present study.

Another possibility is that culture, rather than parenting styles per se, influences the assertive component of the female adolescent personality. It is

apparent in the sex role literature that females are socialized to be sensitive toward and dependent upon others (Gecas and Schwalbe, 1986). In the view of Maccoby and Jacklin (cited in Enright et al., 1980), females are rewarded for passive and dependent behavior. The findings of Enright et al. led them to conclude that autonomy appears to be more related to sex-role socialization than to the perceived democratic, permissive or authoritarian parenting styles. Hence, it right to infer from the findings of the present study that regardless of the parenting style, the girls are socialized to be dependent upon others, or to be nonassertive.

Implications

The implications of the current study are applicable to counsellors, educators, parents, and to further research. The findings from this study bring attention to the need for public education to ensure the psychological health of female adolescents. It is to be hoped that the well-known phrase - "storm and stress" - for the period of adolescence will be replaced by a description of adolescence as being a stage for positive human growth and development.

Counsellors

The findings of this study contain a basis from which counsellors can proceed in their work with the

female adolescent population. Rather than the focus being upon "problem" adolescents, it is right for the counsellor to assess the perceptions of adolescents in regard to the behavior of their mothers toward them. Self-reports to measure the self-esteem and anxiety of adolescents will shed light upon the impact of the perceived parenting style on their personality development. Such an approach is likely to enable the counsellor to gain insight into the interactional patterns of the adolescent with her family members, peers, teachers, and community members.

Group counselling for mothers and daughters as well as individual sessions for mother-daughter dyads would be useful. In such sessions, it would be worthwhile to address the structure of the mother-daughter relationships. Additionally, misconceptions of daughters regarding the behavior of their mothers toward them and vice versa would perhaps be identified and discussed to improve or strengthen mother-daughter communication.

Educators

Educators are also part of the ecosystem in which female adolescents function. The results of this study are intended to assist educators in determining possible reasons for factors such as low school achievement, inadequate social relationships, high absenteeism, and

low motivation of adolescent girls. Perhaps low self-esteem and anxiety of these girls generate the aforementioned factors that likely contribute to their difficulties in school. It is hoped that educators will look beyond the scope of the school to the home environment, and more specifically to mother-daughter relationships to assist those girls who are struggling in school.

Referrals to school counsellors for those who are perceived to be low in self-esteem, anxiety, school achievement, or related problems are typically beneficial to the student and to all others involved. One worthwhile aim of the counselling session would be to understand the personality development of adolescents and their perceived interactional patterns with significant others. Such an understanding is important for the goal of the counsellor to promote alteration of possible dysfunctional patterns in the mother-daughter relationship.

Parents

It is anticipated from the findings of this study that mothers will acknowledge the opportunity to be a constructive part of the personality development of their daughters. The importance of their attitudes and reactions toward their daughters cannot be underestimated.

It is not necessary to reiterate the findings of the current study. However, it is intended that implications for the assertiveness and creativity factors be highlighted. In terms of assertiveness, it is right to caution against the tendency to socialize female adolescents to be dependent rather than assertive individuals. In regard to creativity, attention can be paid to the amount of creativity the girls are exposed to in their home and school environments.

The findings from the current study bring into focus the need for parent education. It is hoped that such an educational facility would help parents to gain insight into the impact of their parenting style, as perceived by the adolescent, on the personality development of their daughters. Knowledge in regard to the effects of sex-role stereotyping, environmental stimulation, and other cultural issues would also likely be an advantage to enhancing positive mother-daughter relationships.

Other Possibilities for Research

Further research possibilities involve the use of instruments other than the Anagram Test for the measure of creativity and the RAS for the measure of assertiveness. It would be interesting to determine whether results that contain the use of alternative measures would be different from the findings of the

present study. Another possibility for research is the use of the Anagram Test without the imposition of the five minute time limit.

A future research possibility is the exploration of other personality components of adolescents which may be influenced by their perceptions of parenting styles. Such personality dimensions include morality and self-identity. Other productive directions would be to study the perceptions of males or younger children in regard to the childrearing practices of their parents. The impact of such perceptions on various aspects of their personalities would be of interest. Additionally, the following familial dyads could be examined in terms of perceived parenting styles and personality development: mother-son, father-son, and father-daughter. Finally, it may be fruitful to reverse the investigation to determine the impact of adolescent personality on the perception of parenting styles.

References

- Atwater, E. (1983). Adolescence. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated.
- Ausubel, D. P., Novak, J. D., & Hanesian, H. (1978). Educational psychology (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Baldwin, A.L. (1948). Socialization and the parent-child relationship. Child Development, 19(3), 127-136.
- Balswick & Macrides (1975). Parental stimulus for adolescent rebellion. Adolescence, 10, 253-266.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Barnes, M. E., & Farrier, S. C. (1985). A longitudinal study of the self-concept of low-income youth. Adolescence, 20(77), 199-205.
- Barron, F. (1970). The disposition towards originality. In P. E. Vernon (Ed.), Creativity: Selected readings (pp. 273-288). New York: Penguin Books. (Original work published 1955)
- Baumrind, D. (1973). The development of instrumental competence through socialization. In A. D. Pick (Ed.), Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology (Vol. 7, pp. 3-46). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Blishen, B. R., & McRoberts H. A. (1976). A revised socioeconomic index for occupations in Canada. Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 13(1), 71-73.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1983). Educational Research (4th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Cattell, R. B. (1976). Self analysis form (rev. ed.). Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). The antecedents of self-esteem. London: W.H. Freeman and Company.
- Datta, L., & Parloff, M. B. (1967). On the relevance of autonomy: Parent-child relationships and early scientific creativity. Proceedings of the 75th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 149-150.
- Davis, G. (1975). Care and feeding of creative adolescents . In R.E. Grinder (Ed.), Studies in Adolescence (3rd ed.). (pp. 562-572). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company Incorporated.
- DeMan, A. F. (1982). Autonomy-control variation in child-rearing and self-image disparity in young adults. Psychological Reports, 51, 1039-1044.
- Bewing, K., & Taft, R. (1973). Some characteristics of the parents of creative twelve-year-olds. Journal of

Personality, 41, 71-85.

Douvan, E. A., & Adelson, J. (1966). The adolescent experience. New York: Wiley.

Einstein, A., & Infeld, L. (1938). The evolution of physics. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Eisler, R. M., Hersen, M., Miller, P. M., & Blanchard, E. B. (1975). Situational determinants of assertive behaviors. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43, 330-340.

Elliott, G. C. (1984). Dimensions of the self-concept: A source of further distinctions in the nature of self-consciousness. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 13(4), 285-306.

Enright, R. D., Lapsley, D. K., Drivas, A. E., & Fehr, L. A. (1980). Parental influences on the development of adolescent autonomy and identity. Journal of youth and adolescence, 9(6), 529-545.

Eskilson, A., Wiley, M., Muehlbauer, G., & Dodder, L. (1986). Parental pressure, self-esteem and adolescent reported deviance: Bending the twig too far. Adolescence, 21, 501-515.

Fillenbaum, S., & Jackman, A. (1961). Dogmatism and anxiety in relation to problem solving: An extension of Rokeach's results. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63, 212-214.

Forman, S., & Forman, B. (1981). Family environment

and its relation to adolescent personality factors.

Journal of Personality Assessment, 45, 163-167.

Fox, E. E. (1969). A life orientation scale: Correlates of biophilia and necrophilia. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Gecas, V. (1971). Parental behavior and dimensions of adolescent self-evaluation. Sociometry, 34(4), 466-482.

Gecas, V. (1972). Parental behavior and contextual variations in adolescent self-esteem. Sociometry, 35(2), 332-345.

Gecas, V. & Schwalbe, M. (1986). Parental behavior and adolescent self-esteem. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 37-46.

Getzels, J., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1976). The creative vision: A longitudinal study of problem finding in art. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Gold, M., & Yanof, D. S. (1985). Mothers, daughters, and girlfriends. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 654-659.

Harris, I. D., & Howard, K. I. (1981). Perceived parental authority: Reasonable and unreasonable. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 10(4), 273-284.

Hill, W. F. (1985). Learning (4th ed.). New York: Harper and Row.

Kandel, D., & Lesser, G. S. (1969). Parent-adolescent

- relationships and adolescent independence in the United States and Denmark. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31(2) 348-358.
- Kaplan, H. B. (1982). Self-attitudes and deviant behavior. Youth and Society, 14(2), 185-211.
- Kelly C. & Goodwin, G. (1983). Adolescents' perception of three styles of parental control. Adolescence, 18, 567-571.
- Krishnamurti, J. (1964). Think on these things. New York: Harper & Row.
- Leahy, R. L. (1981). Parental practices and the development of moral judgment and self-image disparity during adolescence. Developmental Psychology, 17(5), 580-594.
- Lewis, C. (1981). The effects of parental firm control: A reinterpretation of findings. Psychological Bulletin, 90(3), 547-563.
- Litovsky, V., & Dusek, J. (1985). Perceptions of child rearing and self-concept development during the early adolescent years. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 14, 373-387.
- Ludwig, L. D., & Lazarus, A. A. (1972). A cognitive and behavioral approach to the treatment of social inhibition. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 9, 204-206.
- Maccoby, E. (1980). Social development - psychological

growth and the parent-child relationship.

New York: Harchourt Brace Jovanovich, Incorporated.

MacKinnon, D. W. (1970). The personality correlates of creativity: A study of American Architects. In P. E. Vernon (Ed.), Creativity: Selected readings (pp. 289-311). New York: Penguin Books. (Original work published 1962)

Margolies, P. J., & Weintraub, S. (1977). The revised 56-item CRPB as a research instrument: Reliability and factor structure. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 33, 472-476.

McKenry, P. C., Price-Bonham, S., & O'Bryant, S. L. (1981). Adolescent discipline: Different family members' perception. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 10(5), 327-337.

McReynolds, P. (1978). The IPAT anxiety scale questionnaire. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), The Eighth Mental Measurements Yearbook (Vol. 1, 582). New Jersey: The Gryphon Press.

Mednick, S. A. (1962). The associative basis of the creative process. Psychological Review, 69(3), 220-232.

Milgram, S. (1974). Obedience to authority. New York: Harper and Row.

Mouw, J. T. (1969). Effect of dogmatism on levels of cognitive processes. Journal of Educational

Psychology, 60(5, pt. 1), 365-369.

Nichols, R. (1964). Parental attitudes of mothers of intelligent adolescents and creativity of their children. Child Development, 35, 1041-1049.

Olowu, A. (1983). Relating child-rearing technique to the child's self-concept. Early Child Development and Care, 11, 131-144.

Openshaw, D. K., Thomas, D. L., & Rollins, B. C. (1981). Adolescent self-esteem: A Multidimensional perspective. Journal of Early Adolescence, 1(3), 273-282.

Openshaw, D. K., Thomas, D. L., & Rollins, B. C. (1984). Parental influences of adolescent self-esteem. Journal of Early Adolescence, 4(3), 259-274.

Petrie K., & Rotheram, M. (1982). Insulators against stress: Self-esteem and assertiveness. Psychological Reports, 50, 963-966.

Plax, T., Kearney, P., & Beatty, M. J. (1985). Modeling parents' assertiveness: A retrospective analysis. The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 146(4), 449-457.

Rathus, S. A. (1973). A 30-item schedule for assessing assertive behavior. Behavior Therapy, 4, 398-406.

Rich, A. R., & Schroeder, H. E. (1976). Research issues in assertiveness training. Psychological Bulletin, 83, 1081-1096.

Richardson, A. G. (1985). Personality correlates of

- creativity among a sample of Jamaican adolescents. Personality and Individual Differences, 6(6), 771-774.
- Rokeach, M. (1960). The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the adolescent self-image. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). Conceiving the self. New York: Basic Books.
- Schaefer, E. (1965a). Children's reports of parental behavior: An inventory. Child Development, 36, 413-424.
- Schaefer, E. (1965b). A configurational analysis of children's reports of parent behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29(6), 552-557.
- Schludermann, S., & Schludermann, E. (1983). Sociocultural change and adolescents' perceptions of parent behavior. Developmental psychology, 19(5), 674-685.
- Serber, M. (1972). Teaching the nonverbal components of assertive training. Journal of Behavioral Therapy & Experimental Psychiatry, 3, 179-183.
- Silber, E., & Tippet, J. (1965). Self-esteem: Clinical assessment and measurement validation. Psychological Reports, 16, 1017-1071.
- Smith, T. E. (1983). Adolescent Reactions to attempted

parental control and influence techniques. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45(3), 533-542.

Smye, M. D., & Wine, J. D. (1980). A comparison of female and male adolescents' social behaviors and cognitions: A challenge to the assertiveness literature. Sex Roles, 6(2), 213-230.

Stake, J. E., DeVille, C. J., & Pennell, C. L. (1983). The effects of assertive training on the performance self-esteem of adolescent girls. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 12(5), 435-442.

Taylor, I. A. (1975). A retrospective view of creativity investigation. In I. A. Taylor & J. W. Getzels (Eds.), Perspectives in Creativity (pp. 1-36). Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Torrance, E. P. (1970). Causes for concern. In P. E. Vernon (Ed.), Creativity: Selected readings (pp. 355-370). New York: Penguin Books. (Original work published 1962)

Wallach, M. A., & Kogan, N. (1970). A new look at the creativity-intelligence distinction. In P. E. Vernon (Ed.), Creativity: Selected readings (pp. 235-256). New York: Penguin Books. (Original work published 1965)

Watson, D., & Friend, R. (1969). Measurement of social-evaluative anxiety. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33, 448-457.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). Thought and Language.

Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press.

Wolpe, J. (1958). Psychotherapy by reciprocal inhibition. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Zern, D. S., & Stern, G. W. (1983). The impact of obedience on intelligence and self-concept: A longitudinal study involving different situational contexts. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 108, 245-265.

Zern, D. S., & Stern, G. W. (1986). A cross-cultural survey of the effects of anxiety on the relationship between child rearing and cognition. Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 112(2), 219-243.

Appendix 1

Adolescent Perceptions of Parent Behavior
Inventory

Please read the descriptions of each of the three categories A, B, and C that are outlined below. Then place a check mark beside ***ONE*** of the categories A, B, ***OR*** C that best describes your mother's behavior in her interaction with you:

CATEGORY A _____ best describes my mother's behavior in her interaction with me. (If yes, place a check mark in the space beside the letter A. If no, leave the space blank.)

CATEGORY B _____ best describes my mother's behavior in her interaction with me. (If yes, place a check mark in the space beside the letter B. If no, leave the space blank.)

CATEGORY C _____ best describes my mother's behavior in her interaction with me. (If yes, place a check mark in the blank beside the letter C. If no, leave the space blank.)

CATEGORY A

(d)

Often praises me.
Often speaks of the good things I do.
Enjoys talking things over with me.
Enjoys working with me in the house or yard.
Almost always speaks to me with a warm and friendly voice.
Isn't interested in changing me, but likes me as I am.
Makes me feel better after talking over my worries with her.
Gives me sympathy when I need it.
Always listens to my ideas and opinions.
Lets me help to decide how to do things we're working on.

CATEGORY B

(a)

Asks me to tell everything that happens when I'm away from home.

Thinks and talks about my misbehavior long after it is over.
Always tells me exactly how to do my work.
Wants to control whatever I do.
Feels hurt when I don't follow advice.
Thinks I'm not grateful when I don't obey.
Always makes sure I hear about it if I break a rule.
Keeps the home in order by having a lot of rules and regulations for me.
If I don't behave at school, punishes me when I get home.
Almost always punishes me in some way when I do something bad.

CATEGORY C

(1)

Lets me get away without doing work she's told me to do.
Doesn't pay much attention to my misbehavior.
Allows me to go out as often as I please.
Lets me go any place I please without asking.
Does not bother to enforce rules.
Doesn't insist that I do my homework.
Lets me get away with a lot of things.
Lets me off easy when I do something wrong.
Seldomly insists that I do anything.
Gives in easily to my demands.

Appendix 2

Personal Information Form

Age _____

Grade _____

Number of children in family _____

Number of older brothers or sisters _____

Number of younger brothers or sisters _____

Indicate (by circling) whether your biological (natural) parents are:

- (a) living together
- (b) separated or divorced
- (c) widowed
- (d) other (please specify) _____

Indicate (by circling) your relationship to your mother:

- (a) biological (natural mother)
- (b) stepmother
- (c) foster mother
- (d) other (please specify) _____

Indicate (by circling) your relationship to your father:

- (a) biological (natural father)
- (b) stepfather
- (c) foster father
- (d) other (please specify) _____

Indicate (by circling) the number of years of your mother's education (mother as you specified as a, b, c, or d above).

- (a) junior high school
- (b) senior high school
- (c) college or university

Indicate (by circling) the number of years of your father's education (father as you specified as a, b, c, or d above).

- (a) junior high school
- (b) senior high school
- (c) college or university

Mother's Occupation
(mother as you specified as a, b, c, or d above).

Father's Occupation
(father as you specified as a, b, c, or d above).

APPENDIX 3

TABLE 9
PEARSON CORRELATIONS BETWEEN AGE AND THE
PARENTING AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES

Variable ^a	Correlation ^b	Probability
parental group	-.06	.23
self-esteem	.02	.39
anxiety	.02	.39
assertiveness	.08	.16
creativity	-.10	.09

Note. Parental group refers to perceived authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire parental groups collectively.

^aAge was correlated with each variable. ^b $n = 166$ for each correlation.

TABLE 10
 PEARSON CORRELATIONS BETWEEN GRADE AND THE
 PARENTING AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES

Variable ^a	Correlation ^b	Probability
parental group	-.09	.12
self-esteem	.06	.22
anxiety	-.04	.30
assertiveness	.17	.02*
creativity	-.06	.23

Note. The above correlation ($r = .17$, $p = .02$) accounts for 3 percent of the variance ($r^2 = .03$) and is therefore trivial in a practical sense.

^aGrade was correlated with each variable. $b_n = 166$ for each correlation.

TABLE 11
 PEARSON CORRELATIONS BETWEEN BIRTH ORDER AND THE
 PARENTING AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES

Variable ^a	Correlation ^b	Probability
parental group	.20	.01*
self-esteem	-.12	.07
anxiety	-.01	.43
assertiveness	-.09	.13
creativity	-.01	.45

Note. The above correlation ($r = .20$, $p = .01$) accounts for 4 percent of the variance ($r^2 = .04$) and is therefore trivial in a practical sense.

^aBirth order was correlated with each variable. $b_n = 166$ for each correlation.

TABLE 12
 PEARSON CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FAMILY SIZE AND
 THE PARENTING AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES

Variable ^a	Correlation ^b	Probability
parental group	.20	.01*
self-esteem	-.10	.11
anxiety	.004	.48
assertiveness	-.06	.23
creativity	-.03	.34

Note. The above correlation ($r = .20$, $p = .01$) accounts for 4 percent of the variance ($r^2 = .04$) and is therefore trivial in a practical sense.

^aFamily size was correlated with each variable. ^b $n = 166$ for each correlation.

TABLE 13
PEARSON CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MARITAL STATUS AND
THE PARENTING AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES

Variable ^a	Correlation ^b	Probability
parental group	.04	.32
self-esteem	.04	.31
anxiety	-.01	.43
assertiveness	.07	.18
creativity	-.09	.12

^aMarital status was correlated with each variable. ^b $n = 166$ for each correlation.

TABLE 14
 PEARSON CORRELATIONS BETWEEN RELATION OF MOTHER
 AND PARENTING AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES

Variable ^a	Correlation ^b	Probability
parental group	.25	.001**
self-esteem	-.07	.18
anxiety	.13	.05*
assertiveness	-.02	.41
creativity	-.06	.23

Note. The above correlations ($r = .13$, $p = .05$; $r = .25$, $p = .001$) account for 2 percent ($r^2 = .02$) and 6 percent ($r^2 = .06$) of the variance respectively and are therefore trivial in a practical sense.

^aRelationship to mother (e.g., biological, step) was correlated with each variable. ^b $n = 166$ for each correlation.

TABLE 15
 PEARSON CORRELATIONS BETWEEN RELATION OF FATHER
 AND PARENTING AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES

Variable ^a	Correlation ^b	Probability
parental group	.15	.03*
self-esteem	-.03	.35
anxiety	.11	.09
assertiveness	.10	.10
creativity	-.11	.08

Note. The above correlation ($r = .15$, $p = .03$) accounts for 2 percent of the variance ($r^2 = .02$) and is therefore trivial in a practical sense.

^aRelationship to father (e.g., biological, step) was correlated with each variable. ^b $n = 168$ for each correlation.

TABLE 16
 PEARSON CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS
 AND THE PARENTING AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES

Variable ^a	Correlation ^b	Probability
parental group	.08	.15
self-esteem	-.09	.13
anxiety	-.02	.40
assertiveness	-.18	.01*
creativity	.01	.44

Note. The above correlation ($r = -.18$, $p = .01$) accounts for 3 percent of the variance ($r^2 = .03$) and is therefore trivial in a practical sense.

^aThe socioeconomic status of the family was correlated with each variable. ^b $n = 166$ for each correlation.

TABLE 17
PEARSON CORRELATIONS BETWEEN EDUCATION OF THE MOTHER
AND THE PARENTING AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES

Variable ^a	Correlation ^b	Probability
parental group	.23	.002*
self-esteem	-.03	.33
anxiety	.04	.32
assertiveness	.02	.40
creativity	-.07	.17

Note. The above correlation ($r = .23$, $p = .002$) accounts for 5 percent of the variance ($r^2 = .05$) and is therefore trivial in a practical sense.

^aThe educational level of the mother was correlated with each variable. ^b $n = 166$ for each correlation.

TABLE 18
 PEARSON CORRELATIONS BETWEEN EDUCATION OF THE FATHER
 AND THE PARENTING AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES

Variable ^a	Correlation ^b	Probability
parental group	.22	.002***
self-esteem	-.14	.04*
anxiety	.16	.02**
assertiveness	-.05	.27
creativity	-.06	.22

~~Note.~~ The above correlations ($r = -.14$, $p = .04$; $r = .16$, $p = .02$; $r = .22$, $p = .002$) account for 2 percent ($r^2 = .02$), 3 percent ($r^2 = .03$), and 5 percent ($r^2 = .05$) of the variance respectively and are therefore trivial in a practical sense.

^aThe educational level of the father was correlated with each variable. ^b $n = 166$ for each correlation.

TABLE 19
 PEARSON CORRELATIONS BETWEEN OCCUPATION OF THE MOTHER
 AND THE PARENTING AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES

Variable ^a	Correlation ^b	Probability
parental group	.07	.19
self-esteem	-.001	.50
anxiety	-.03	.34
assertiveness	-.13	.05*
creativity	.10	.11

Note. The above correlation ($r = -.13$, $p = .05$) accounts for 2 percent of the variance ($r^2 = .02$) and is therefore trivial in a practical sense.

^aThe occupation of the mother was correlated with each variable. ^b $n = 166$ for each correlation.

TABLE 20
PEARSON CORRELATIONS BETWEEN OCCUPATION OF THE FATHER
AND THE PARENTING AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES

Variable ^a	Correlation ^b	Probability
parental group	.03	.35
self-esteem	-.11	.07
anxiety	.08	.16
assertiveness	-.12	.06
creativity	.01	.45

^aThe occupation of the father was correlated with each variable. ^b $n = 166$ for each correlation.

APPENDIX 4)

TABLE 21
SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CATHOLIC AND
PROTESTANT DENOMINATIONS ON SELF-ESTEEM

Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Catholic	33	27.60	4.81	-1.15	164	.25
Protestant	133	28.60	4.70			

TABLE 22
SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CATHOLIC AND
PROTESTANT DENOMINATIONS ON ANXIETY

Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Catholic	33	37.49	11.77	-1.71	164	.09
Protestant	133	41.30	11.32			

TABLE 23
SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CATHOLIC AND
PROTESTANT DENOMINATIONS ON CREATIVITY

Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Catholic	33	12.24	11.83			
				1.41	164	.16
Protestant	133	9.25	10.67			

TABLE 24
SUMMARY OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CATHOLIC AND
PROTESTANT DENOMINATIONS ON ASSERTIVENESS

Group	N	Mean	SD	t	df	p
Catholic	33	55.18	16.06			
				.37	164	.71
Protestant	133	53.90	18.44			